

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXVII, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1934

WHOLE No. 737

## POETIC JUSTICE IN THE AENEID

(Continued from page 149)

It was suggested above (page 148 A) that in a sense Dido turned the tables on Aeneas, with a certain degree of justice. In two other places, Aeneas does—or permits—something that is not quite right, and in both cases he and his pay for it.

The first of these incidents takes place at the fall of Troy. The Greek Androgeus and his companions mistake a group of Trojans (including Aeneas) for Greeks (2.370-375); the Trojans promptly take advantage of the mistake and kill the Greeks (383-385). The Trojans have done nothing questionable up to this point. But now Coroebus has the idea of working out the stratagem suggested to him by Androgeus's mistake; he dons Androgeus's armor (391-393), and the others, including Aeneas<sup>63</sup>, readily (note *laeta*, 395) follow suit (394-395). At first their success (385-386) continues; more Greeks are cut down by these Trojans masquerading as Greeks (396-398). But soon the pseudo-Greeks are cut down by their fellow-Trojans, who deem them Greeks (410-412). Coroebus, the leader, is the first to fall (424-426); Rhipheus the just<sup>64</sup>, Hypanis, Dymas, holy Panthus are slain (426-430).

The second incident occurs at the Strophades. The Trojans have no right to kill the cattle of the Harpies<sup>65</sup>. At least from the point of view of the Harpies this act, committed to gain food, is well punished, first, when the Harpies seize and pollute the tempting viands (3.227-228, 233-234) till there is nothing left fit to eat (244), secondly, when Celaeno prophesies that the Trojans will some day be so famished that they will eat what seems to be utterly inedible (256-257). This prediction gives the Trojans a very bad quarter of an hour (259-260), which probably, if we view the situation from the highest ethics, they deserve; the thought of this 'hideous hunger' (367) haunts Aeneas, till, in response to his anxious questioning (365-367), Helenus utters words of reassurance (394-395).

In one other case, the Trojans, it might be said, behave badly; granted that they do, grievously do they answer for it. The young folk mock the prisoner Sinon (2.63-64), whose dupes they really are (248-249). *Miseri* they are, these boys and girls who gayly deride

<sup>63</sup>Aeneas does not say that he did this: note the third person in 394-395. But he employs the first person in 396, and throughout the rest of the passage (409, 411, etc.). Hence we must conclude that he participated in a subterfuge which, on second thought, he seems to consider questionable, or at least unwise. Certainly, the gods disapprove it (402).

<sup>64</sup>Compare note 3, above.

<sup>65</sup>The right of necessity, which they might have urged, is not a cogent plea in the minds of those who really care about justice. Possibly, however, the Trojans thought that the cattle, scattered everywhere without a guard (3.220-221), were no one's property. <To me, verses 220-221 clearly show that the Trojans thought that the cattle "were no one's property". How wrong this view, in itself natural (note especially *passim* and *nullo custode*, 220, 221), is brought out for us by *At subiit*.... (225) as sharply as it was brought out by the facts for the Trojans. C. K.>

the captive, and then, because they and theirs have trusted the deceiver, joyously sing hymns and lay their hands upon the rope by which they draw the engine of destruction into the city (239). This the *pueri* and the *puellae* do by day (238); but, when night comes, Sinon can laugh at the luckless *pueri*, as they stand, captives, with their terrified mothers, in a long line beside the captured treasures (763-767), under the guardianship of Sinon's supposed enemy, *dirus Ulixes* (762). Fittingly enough they are imprisoned *porticibus vacuis Iunonis asylo* (761), in porticoes empty of guardian divinity, and valueless as an *asylum*, for Juno has gone forth, *saevissima*, to hold the gates and call in the invading foemen who are her allies (612-614).

Here the punishment seems too severe for the crime. If it is proper Vergilian ethics to taunt a fallen foe (Aeneas himself does it often, in Book 10), it is doubtless proper Vergilian ethics to taunt a prisoner of war. In any case, we must note that the taunting of Sinon is not stressed<sup>66</sup>, and that it is presently lost sight of in the genuine sympathy which his clever words excite.

But it is time to turn to some of the indubitable cases of persons who are done by as they have done to others<sup>67</sup>. We may mention first the historical case of Tarquin, who, *notoriously superbus*, is slain by one whose *anima* is in a *worthy* sense *superba* (6.817-818). Pyrrhus, like Tarquin, merits the epithet *superbus* (3.326) in its worst sense; he, like Tarquin, finally suffers as his *superbia* deserves. He slays Priam at the altar (2.550-551), which, Hecuba had thought, would be a protection (523); later he is himself taken unawares and slain at the altar by Orestes (3.331-332). There is also something particularly brutal about these murders. Pyrrhus apparently cuts off Priam's head, and *truncus* and *caput* are left lying on the desolate shore (2.557-558). Orestes 'butchers' (3.332) Pyrrhus. Turnus deals as brutally with young Pallas as Pyrrhus deals with old Priam; he, too, pays fitting penalty. When he is ruthlessly pursuing Pallas, he cries out (10.443), *cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset*. Yet he expects Aeneas to show such pity for aged fatherhood as he himself did not show: *Dauni miserere senectae* is his plea to Aeneas (12.934)<sup>68</sup>. But Aeneas can show no

<sup>66</sup>The reference to the jeering crowd around the prisoner (2.63-64) is as casual as is Horace's reference to the shouting throng that collects when the bore is dragged off to court (Sermones 1.9.77-78).

<sup>67</sup>Such cases recur in the Bible, notably in the story of Esther (see Esther, Chapters 6-7). Compare Genesis 9:6; Isaiah 33:1; Matthew 26:52.

<sup>68</sup>It is particularly unfair of Turnus to appeal to Aeneas's love for Anchises. To his words, *fuit et tibi talis Anchises genitor* (12.933-934), Aeneas might justly have replied, *Sed non fui ei talis ego filius*. When Turnus had himself been urged in similar terms, by Latinus, to take thought for Daunus (12.43-44 *miserere parentis longaevi*), he had not been moved (45-46); in his haughty response he had answered only that portion of Latinus's speech that dealt with himself (note *pro me*, 48).

<On Aeneid 12.933-934 I wrote as follows: "talis can only mean 'as old and as anxious as my father is at the moment.' Aeneas and his father Anchises were never exactly in the plight in which Turnus and his father are now". I ought to have said, "<If we keep to facts>, talis can....". If Turnus's words, *fuit et tibi talis Anchises*

mercy to the killer and despoiler of Pallas. He has Turnus helpless before him even as Turnus had had Pallas<sup>69</sup>, and (12.950) he buries his sword within Turnus's breast, even as Turnus (10.485) had driven his spear through the breast of Pallas.

Arruns kills Camilla stealthily: he takes her unawares, while she carelessly (*incauta*, 11.781) pursues her prey, and pays no attention to the sound or the breeze of the missile until she has received a mortal wound (801-804). Opis, assigned by Diana to the task of slaying Camilla's slayer (591-594)<sup>70</sup>, lies in wait for Arruns (852-853); with the words *huc periture veni, capias ut digna Camillae praemia* (856-857), she lets fly her weapon, and at the same time Arruns hears the whiz and the dart is fast within his body. The descriptions of the two deaths are so similar that they produce upon us almost the effect of strophe and antistrophe. We may note the occurrence of the same or almost the same words (*aurae, sonitus, teli, haesit; auras, sonantis, teli, haesit*) in 801-804, 863-864. Again, the appearance of Camilla's victim, who *fulgebat in armis* (769), is recalled by that of Arruns himself, Opis's victim, as Opis saw him *fulgentem armis* (854); it may be that, as Conington says, "...Opis might be naturally struck with the glittering of Arruns' arms, which would excite her indignation as a sort of additional insult". The effect is, I think, enhanced by the fact that this armor would remind her of the way that Camilla had met her death. It may have been through her own fault, her greed<sup>71</sup>; but Arruns too meets his death through his own fault, his attempt to trick Apollo<sup>72</sup>. Because of this attempt, Arruns deservedly suffers in one way in which Camilla does not. Diana has promised to give due burial to Camilla's body and arms (593-594). Hence, when Opis flies off and Camilla's comrades flee (867-868), we may assume that Camilla's remains will still be taken care of. But, when Arruns's comrades abandon him (865-866), we assume that this is arranged by Apollo, who, granting to Arruns part of his casuistic prayer, is letting him be *inglorius* (793).

Perhaps Jupiter, too, is meting out special justice when he sends a hideous, winged, serpent-crowned fury, one of the twin *pestes* called *Dirae*, children of Nox and sisters of Tartarean Megaera (12.845-848), to warn Turnus and Juturna that all hope must be abandoned. Juno had once sought the earth (7.323) even as Jupiter's messenger is seeking it now (12.860), and had summoned to serve as her emissary a hateful *Dira* of horrible appearance, with serpent locks (7.329) and dusky wings (408), another *pestis* (505) whose mother is Nox<sup>73</sup> (331) and whose sisters are denizens of Tartarus

*genitor*, are taken literally, we have Vergil involving Turnus, in his emotional upheaval, in an error such as Iarbas and Anna make, as set forth by me in my addition to note 51, above. One might even be forced to hold that Turnus had descended to a downright falsehood. C. K. >

<sup>69</sup>Turnus has sunk to the ground, wounded in the leg (12.926-927). On Pallas's helplessness, compare Professor Knapp's note (in his revised edition: see note 51, above) on 10.480-481: "since Pallas has flung his spear (474), and evidently has no other at hand, he must await, helplessly, Turnus's cast". In the case of Turnus as in that of Pallas the spear pierces both *dipeus* and *lorica* (10.482-485, 12.923-926).

<sup>70</sup>Compare note 13, above.

<sup>71</sup>This matter will be treated again below.

<sup>72</sup>This has been discussed.

<sup>73</sup>The words *sata Nocte* used in 7.331 recur in the description of the other *Dira* (12.860).

(327-328). This creature Juno had called up from the nethermost regions (325) to stir up Turnus and set the war going, even as Jupiter sends the second *pestis* (12.865) down from his lofty realms (849-750, 853) to proclaim to Turnus the end of the war. Juno has yielded (841); Juturna, too, now departs in despair (885-886); and Turnus, instead of showing the scornful defiance with which he had greeted the first fury in the guise of Calybe (7.435-444), or responding with seething excitement such as had carried him away when he had learned her true identity (7.460-466), now, at sight of this second fury in the guise of a little bird (12.862), feels the cold helplessness of utter despair (867-868).

This last case is, of course, not given as a precise example of a person's suffering in the way in which he has made others suffer, but as one more of the many instances in the Aeneid of the eternal fitness of things. Frequently instances seem to illustrate our own aphorism that "pride goeth before a fall", the idea of the generation by *ἕξις* of *ἀρετή* that recurs in Greek tragedy and philosophy. Naturally, this idea appears often in the pages of a poet who deems it a duty and a glory to humble the proud (*debellare superbos*, 6.853)<sup>74</sup>. Thus Dares, arrogant in what he believes to be his own supremacy when no contestant appears to dispute his title, claims the prize-bull as his own, and, seizing its horn, rudely asks Aeneas why he is kept waiting, and orders him to award the gift to him at once (5.381-385). He is *debellatus* indeed when his life is spared by Entellus only at Aeneas's interference (461-467), and his companions help him off, leaving palm and bull alike for Entellus (472). The final touch is added when the bull is sacrificed by Entellus, as a substitute for Dares himself (477-484)!

What happens in the mimic fray of the games happens again in real war. Repeatedly men are cut down in battle after they have uttered mighty boasts. Anxur had been 'talking big' (10.547) and proclaiming his own prospects of a long life (549) just before Aeneas inflicted on him a wound (546) which we may assume to be fatal; the next instant the exulting Tarquinius (550) is forced to beg for his life, and, while he is begging, is slain (554-555). Arruns is puffed up with vainglory (11.854)<sup>75</sup> at the moment when Opis kills him. Murranus is bragging of his long and lofty line of ancestors (12.529-530) when he is, quite literally, brought low; he is flung out of his chariot to the ground (532) and dies beneath the trampling hoofs of his horses, who are wholly unmindful of their once proud master (533-534). Very effective is the scene in which Mezentius's victim, *altus* Orodes (10.737), while he is dying, predicts his slayer's own speedy death (10.739-741), and Mezentius, laughing his scorn (742), simply retorts (743-744), *Nunc morere. Ast de me divum pater atque hominum rex viderit*. The reader comprehends the irony here, for he knows that the prediction is soon to come true. The same irony is present when Pyrrhus and Turnus send haughty messages to the dead through their destined victims, Pyrrhus to his father Achilles through

<sup>74</sup>Compare what was said (three paragraphs earlier) of the person who stands as the member *par excellence* of this group, Tarquinius Superbus.

<sup>75</sup>Compare note 12, above.

Priam (2.547-549), to whom he finally (550) gives the same pithy command (*Nunc morere*) as Mezentius does to Orodes, Turnus to Priam through Pandarus (9.742). Soon, we know, Pyrrhus and Turnus themselves will be able to convey in person such messages to the shades.

The three men just named are perhaps the outstanding examples of *superbia* in the Aeneid. Reference has been made, and will be made again to the particular appropriateness of the manner by which Pyrrhus meets his death. The humbling of Mezentius, *contemptor divum*, and of Turnus, famed for his *violentia*, is also most effectively brought about. Both are forced to 'eat their own words'. Mezentius's haughty response to Orodes, just quoted, is tantamount to a mocking challenge to Jupiter to show his power. Mezentius is quite indifferent to the father of gods and king of men: to him the only god is his own right hand—may that and the missile that he throws with it be auspicious to him, he cries (10.773-774). But the missile goes astray: it misses Aeneas, and hits a man for whom it was never intended, who was almost in the position of innocent bystander<sup>76</sup> (776-782). On the other hand, when *prius* Aeneas, as he is significantly termed (783), hurls his spear, Mezentius is seriously wounded (783-786) and incapacitated (794-795). Seeing his father's peril, the noble Lausus springs to his defense, and in effecting the rescue loses his own life. Mezentius's right hand has failed indeed! *Ubi nunc Mezentius acer et illa efferata vis animi <est>?*, as Aeneas asks (897-898) when they meet in their final encounter. These words of Aeneas would be almost inhuman did we not believe that a higher purpose lies behind them; he wants to show Mezentius that *self-sufficiency* is *insufficiency*. Aeneas prays not to his own hand, but to the father of the gods and to Apollo (875) before he enters the final conflict with the discomfited *contemptor divum*.

In the same way Turnus again and again fails to make good his boasts and taunts. He depends on his weapons as Mezentius does on his. With his characteristic *fiducia*, he says to Latinus (12.50-53),

Et nos tela, pater, ferrumque haud debile dextra  
spargimus, et nostro sequitur de vulnere sanguis.  
Longe illi dea mater erit, quae nube fugacem  
femineae tegat et vanis sese occultat umbris.

But at the crucial moment his sword breaks, and he, not Aeneas, has recourse to flight (12.731-734). Indeed, his implication that Aeneas is *fugax* is wholly unfair. So, too, is his implication that Aeneas depends on the protection of a goddess. The Venus of the Aeneid never interferes in battle to protect her son, except on two occasions when she is justified in so doing, because he is being beset by unfair means which he is too honorable to know how to cope with. She helps him once (12.411-419) when she heals the wound which was baselessly inflicted on him while he was trying to maintain the

truce that the Italians had shamefully violated, once (786-787) when she uses her arts to restore to Aeneas his lost weapon after Juturna has audaciously rendered a like service to Turnus. Incidentally, we may note that this service on the part of a *dea soror* (784-785) is not spurned by Turnus, who, for lack of the sword on which he once counted so confidently, had been reduced to play himself the rôle of *fugax* (733, 742) that he had once assigned so contemptuously to Aeneas. The Venus of the Aeneid behaves by no means as does the Aphrodite—or the Apollo—of the Iliad. The Homeric episode in which Apollo removes Aeneas from the field to save him from peril and manufactures a phantom Aeneas to take the place of the real one (Iliad 5.445-453) is utilized by Vergil; but in the Aeneid Juno, not Apollo, manufactures the wraith of clouds (10.636), for the benefit of Turnus, not of Aeneas, and Turnus, not Aeneas, is consequently *fugax*<sup>77</sup>. Quo fugis, Aeneas?, Turnus shouts derisively (649), as he pursues the phantom; but soon he finds that he himself has fled (670). We are sorry for him now, in his keen realization of the disgrace that he has incurred in abandoning his comrades in arms (673-675). But he should have profited by this bitter lesson, and not have taken subsequently about Aeneas's fleeing under the protection of a mist supplied by a goddess.

Again, Turnus expresses approval of the idea of a single combat between himself and Aeneas (11.442-444), and expects that the announcement of this will not be pleasing to Aeneas (12.75-76). But actually Aeneas, man of peace, rejoices at the idea of making an end of the war. He is delighted when at last he meets Turnus (note *gaudens*, 12.109, and *lactitia exsultans*, 12.700), whereas Turnus is completely dejected at the time of the solemnizing of the pact which provides for the encounter between the two champions (12.219-221).

Turnus's self-confidence, his *fiducia* (9.126), is likewise misplaced when it leads him to believe that he has on his side gods and fates on whom he may depend. The miraculous transformation of Aeneas's ships into nymphs is, he maintains, a bad omen for the Trojans (9.128): Nil me fatalia terrent si qua Phryges prae se iactant responsa deorum...., he boldly cries (133-134), and he adds complacently (136-137), Sunt et mea contra fata mihi.... Turnus indeed has *sua fata*; but that is no help to him, for they exist merely to call him to his doom. Jupiter makes that quite clear when he says (10.471-472), etiam sua Turnum fata vocant<sup>78</sup>. Jupiter is willing that these *fata* may be postponed for the nonce<sup>79</sup>, but they cannot be opposed to any greater

<sup>77</sup>Jupiter had given Juno permission to arrange for Turnus's flight (10.624). Juno promptly avails herself of this permission, though she earlier reproached Venus (just as Turnus does) for substituting a phantom for the real man in order to save Aeneas (10.81-82). Juno, like her protégé, is only too glad to fall for the sake of her own cause into the very misdeed of which she falsely accuses another!

<sup>78</sup>I suppose that Jupiter is not using *fata* exactly as Turnus is using the word. We may note the speech (9.136-138) in which Turnus is telling us what it is his *destiny* to do. Jupiter, however, employs *fata*, as we often do 'fate', almost in the sense of 'end', 'death'. In 2.506 *fata* alone seems almost to equal *finis fatum* (2.554). But this does not affect my point: irony is present in Jupiter's echo of Turnus's words, whether or not he is slightly altering the application of those words.

<sup>79</sup>Compare note 77, above. Contrast his earlier attitude (9.805), when he interfered with Juno's protection of Turnus.

<sup>76</sup>For the idea that at times the punishment of the guilty involves the innocent compare notes 10, 34, above, Horace, Carmina 3.2.26-30, and the parallels from Greek tragedy cited in the note on that passage by Professor Clifford H. Moore. Moreover, for the moment all incidents have a direct bearing on the story of Mezentius, and any other character's fate must be subordinate to, and in a measure dependent on, his. So Iarbas's rôle is conditioned by Dido's; compare note 56, above.



extent than that. Ironically enough, even that resistance which Jupiter does for the moment permit is not at all of the kind in which Turnus himself would take pride. There is no thought in the mind of either Juno or Jupiter that Turnus is boldly to use the sword against his hated enemy, as he had boasted his *fata* permitted him to do<sup>80</sup>; flight, not courageous fighting, is to be his defense<sup>81</sup>. Jupiter's concession to Juno (10.624 *tolle fuga Turnum atque instantibus eripe fati*) is not the sort of favor that Turnus expected from Juno when he said so arrogantly to Calybe<sup>82</sup> (7.438-439), *nec regia Iuno immemor est nostri*. Juno is on Turnus's side, and she tries to thwart the fates in his behalf, but she is really powerless against them<sup>83</sup>, and admits as much, in the end, to Juturna (12.149-150). Finally, Turnus himself is convinced that all the superior powers are definitely against him. Fortune offers no escape (637), and the gods have withdrawn their favor (647). He will follow wherever *deus* and *dura fortuna* call him (677). That, he knows, is to death (676). *Iam iam fata, soror, superant* is a far cry from *Sunt et mea contra fata mihi* . . . , as Turnus's acknowledgment, *di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis* (12.895), is a far cry from *Nil me fatalia terrent* . . . *responsa deorum* . . . (12.133-134). Turnus's *fata* are definitely not a match for those of Aeneas; Jupiter has literally weighed<sup>84</sup> fates against fates (12.725-727), and those on which Turnus once prided himself have been found wanting.

Another display of arrogance for which Turnus suffers retribution occurs on the occasion of the appearance before him of the supposed Calybe. After indicating that her age renders her the object of vain delusions (7.440-442), he concludes by a thrust at her sex (444): *bella viri pacemque gerent quis bella gerenda*. Quite apart from the fact that the Fury, female though she is, is eminently fitted not only for the stirring up of wars, as Juno says to her (335), but also for their management<sup>85</sup>, as Allecto says to her (455), Turnus is to be

proved hopelessly wrong. For *vir*—Latinus, Drances—are to oppose this war of his and to fail him utterly; and, crowning irony, his only real help in time of need will come from a woman. I refer here not to Juturna (she is a *dea*; Turnus does not criticize goddesses, except when he suspects Aeneas of being helped by them<sup>86</sup>), but to Camilla. When Turnus is desperately defying the pacifist arguments of the *vir* Drances, he claims that he still has sources of aid; not only *Messapus erit felixque Tolumnius*<sup>87</sup> (11.429), but also *est et Volscorum egregia de gente Camilla* (432). Debate ensues (445-446). Meanwhile word comes that the enemy in battle array is close at hand (447-450). Even now those who ought to be efficiently supporting Turnus are in a state of excitement, grief, uncertainty, and terror (453-454). Even among the noncombatants the women act more effectively than the men! Latinus is, as usual, utterly futile (469-470), but Amata at least does something; taking a great throng of matrons and Lavinia, she goes to a temple to offer gifts and prayers (477-485).

Meanwhile on the field Turnus himself hurriedly gives orders to various chieftains—Volusus, Messapus, Coras—all at once (463-465). But no one else displays any initiative till Camilla, followed by her whole feminine cohort, speeds up to him to offer a plan and a program of cooperation (498-506). She is ready to engage, alone, the enemy's cavalry (*audeo*, 503, and *sola*, 504, are striking); thus Turnus will be free to guard the walls and to concentrate on the fighting that is done afoot. Turnus is grateful to her; he accepts the suggestion that she—a woman!—has made, and appoints her—a woman!—the general to carry it out, in command over regiments of men and over the great Messapus himself (508-519). She makes good, too. Tarchon has to rebuke his men for fleeing from a woman (734). At the end she brings about her own downfall<sup>88</sup> through her woman's love of finery (782); but she redeems herself in part by loyally directing to her commander-in-chief her last thoughts and her last words (825-827). Acca faithfully carries out her dying orders, and conveys to Turnus the sad tidings not only that Camilla has fallen, but that, as the result, the entire force is being routed (896-900). At the death of this woman, not only her own cohort of maidens, but all the men whom she led, including Turnus's own Rutulians, had fled abjectly (868-875). At this news—final irony—the *vir* Turnus himself completely loses his head. He abandons the well-laid plan that he had worked out at his conference with Camilla, and deserts the ambush where he had been lying in wait for Aeneas. The latter arrives when Turnus is just out of sight, and safely makes his way to the city-walls (901-911).

We turn now to the scene between Camilla and her unnamed Ligurian opponent (699-701) whom she is outriding (702-703). He is an unmanly man, dependent upon trickery rather than upon prowess (701,

<sup>80</sup>Compare note 78, above.

<sup>81</sup>Compare the second preceding paragraph.

<sup>82</sup>This arrogance is increased by the fact that it is, supposedly, to the priestess of Juno (7.419), whom he is treating so discourteously, that he makes this boast.

<sup>83</sup>Juno, too, for all her early scorn of the fates (1.39), has to yield to the fates that are supporting Aeneas and opposing his enemies. For another correspondence between Juno's behavior and Turnus's see note 77, above.

<sup>84</sup>In 1.239 Venus talks figuratively of the weighing of fates.

<sup>85</sup>In Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 56.196, note 79, I commented on the close correspondence of this verse with 440, and suggested a change in punctuation that (I think) increases the parallelism in general of the speeches in which these verses occur. Again we have almost the effect of strophe and antistrophe.

<Professor Hahn proposes to punctuate 7.452-453 thus: *En ego, victa situ quam veri effeta senectus arma inter regum falsa formidine ludit*. Others—Ribbeck, Conington, Hirtzel, I myself—punctuate *En ego victa situ, quam* . . . Professor Hahn thinks—rightly—that the pause after *ego* is effective. My translation, "See, here I am, mastered by . . .", shows that I too saw this point, even though I did not set a comma after *situ*. Professor Hahn continues thus: ". . . the interpolation of the relative might serve to ameliorate the slight harshness resulting from the absence of the connective (*que* in 440) between *victa* and *effeta* . . .". I understand this as meaning that Professor Hahn regards *victa situ* as belonging in syntax within the *quam*-clause. Such a view I cannot accept. It produces a harshness that I should call grievous, and utterly un-Vergilian.

I would myself now punctuate thus: *En ego, victa situ, quam* . . . This punctuation brings out clearly the pause after *ego*, and equally clearly the pause that beyond doubt is to be felt after *situ*, as after *ego*. There is, further, no harshness whatever, for no need is felt of a connective after *situ*.

Why demand or even expect complete parallelism between 452-453 and 440? In 440 Turnus is speaking to the disguised Fury; in 452-453 the Fury, in far more impassioned way, is speaking of herself. C. K. >

<sup>86</sup>Compare again the paragraph referred to in note 81, above.

<sup>87</sup>The two leaders whom Turnus specially mentions are primarily responsible for the breaking of the truce: see 12.258, 290, referred to six paragraphs below.

<sup>88</sup>Is there in the change of tense hint that Camilla is a more present help in time of trouble even than the two men?

<sup>89</sup>Compare below.

704), and there is far more of the *vir* about her than about him, but he knows that he can work upon her by sneering at her on the ground that she is a *femina*, and, as such, a coward who depends upon her horse and dares not risk a hand-to-hand fight with him on the ground (705-708). The *bellatrix virgo*, who is probably somewhat sensitive on the score of her sex, and who is of far too noble a spirit to suspect others of tricks to which she would not stoop herself, fails to see through the plot, and leaps in fury to the ground, whereupon the schemer, who never had any intention of doing likewise, speeds away on his own horse, *vicisse dolo ratus* (712). But he has underestimated her abilities, and now his jibe (708, *iam nosces ventosa ferat cui gloria fraudem*) comes true in a way of which he had never thought, for she on foot overtakes him on horseback (718-720), and easily (721) makes an end of him. There is just as much irony in his meeting his death at the hands of the woman-warrior whom he pretended to despise as there is in Turnus's great dependence on this woman-warrior after his expressed contempt for the entire sex (7.444).

(To be concluded)

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

## REVIEWS

A Course of Study in Latin for Junior and Senior High Schools: Chicago Public Schools, Grades VIII-IX. Bulletin L-L89 of the Board of Education, City of Chicago. Chicago: Board of Education (1931)<sup>1</sup>. Pp. 76.

The four-term Latin course designed by a Committee of Chicago teachers under the direction of their Bureau of Curriculum gives (10) as its main objective for Junior High School pupils the "Awakening and growth of interest in word-meaning and word-relation in the expression of thought". Secondary aims (10) are "Interpretation of environment in relation to the geography, history, life, mythology, and religion of Rome" and "Discovery and exploration of the Latin element in English language and literature". Learning the Latin language seems not to be among the Chicago pupil's responsibilities, although in a section of the material devoted to each term's curriculum it is suggested that the progressive ability to read, comprehend, and translate Latin is to be furthered by a number of practices. A section of each term's outline treats phases of Roman life and history under the title *Res Romanae*. The content and methods relating to English are entitled Latin in English.

<I give here a fuller hint of the contents of the book.

After a Foreword (6-9) comes a statement labelled "Objectives" (10) and another labelled "Learning Objectives" (11). On pages 50-60 there is a statement of "Minimum Essentials". This is meant to cover work for two years in the Junior High School and one year in the Senior High School. There is a General Bibliography (61-72), and some specimens of Chicago Latin Examinations (73-76).

The rest of the book (12-58) falls into four sections, which deal with the 8 B, 8 A, 9 B, and 9 A grades respectively. In connection with each grade the following matters are considered: Reading of Latin; Reading Practice; Pronunciation; Vocabulary; Inflection; Syntax; Writing in Latin; *Res Romanae*; Latin in English. It will be seen that to each grade are devoted about 14 pages. The matter in these pages is spread out in such fashion that very little appears on any one page. C. K.>

No reader of this Course will fail to observe that its organization and procedures are those of the General Report of the Classical Investigation carried to their logical development. It seems unfitting that the debt to the Report is not mentioned, particularly since so much care is taken to acknowledge far smaller influence of other publications. One of the popular books for beginners can be quartered to provide the text material of the Course.

The *quantity of Latin* prescribed by this Course falls far short of the proper quantity. But we have grown used to watching a constant curtailment of content as new State and local curricula have been printed. Careful teachers everywhere are discreetly padding the language content of their courses and are supplementing Junior High School books, especially if their pupils are to move into other Schools, under other teachers, and to come in contact with pupils from other Junior High Schools.

In another regard serious questions obtrude with respect to this book. Are the *Res Romanae* sufficiently impressive in number or in nature to bring pupils to the sociological objective? Do the bits of Latin in English which the pupils discover and explore justify the prominence of that feature of the objectives? Even those pupils who are called "accelerated students" pursue only those activities in which good Latin pupils have always found recreation, and pursue them in no more systematic fashion than is done elsewhere.

The skill of the curriculum expert is sensed more generally throughout this pamphlet than is the conviction of classicists whose standards and enthusiasm, having roots deep in traditions of scholarship, must always contribute more to their teaching than any outline or plan can contribute. In this pamphlet lists under the heads of bibliography and equipment, for instance, show no such care as is shown by those in the Ohio Bulletin on First-Year Latin, reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.112. Inaccuracies in authors' names suggest no intelligent knowledge of their works, or sincere recommendation of their works (i. e. a recommendation based on first-hand intimate knowledge of them); note e. g. "Gardener" and "Sreiber" (61) for 'Gardner' and 'Schreiber', "Matchison" (62) for 'Mitchison', and "Shuway" (67) for 'Shumway'. No Latinist could be inspired to great endeavor by such a direction as (49) "In story reading encourage student to 'let himself go' with the thread of the story", or (27) "Have students do considerable work in tracing words found in English sentences to their Latin origin".

Responsible teachers who, in our Great Educational Reform period, advocated two years for the work in beginning Latin expected the increased time to permit fuller attention to secondary objectives together with more thorough mastery of a language-content even larger than that which was conventional twenty years ago. Conservative observers have seen only a shocking delimitation of the language element with no appreciable additions to the 'cultural'. They point out that with each year demands upon Latin teachers have shrunk as one elective subject after another has come into the Schools and one requirement after another has

been modified. No longer must a Latin teacher cope with inflexible Entrance Examination problems or basement-quartile intelligence quotients, and yet his standards must mask their degradation under the same names as the vocational subjects and the pseudo-sciences employ.

One good result of this Chicago syllabus will come when some cultured but isolated teacher in a prairie village reads it and gives thanks that his town's tax-duplicate has never allowed the erection of a Junior High School. I can see no other good result possible from it. However, when such a teacher notices that Chicago pupils will be expected after these two years to enter a fifth-term course to discover and explore the delights of the subjunctive, participles, ablative ideas, and indefinite pronouns, his thanksgiving may formulate in his mind the fallacy that all big-city Schools are second-rate and all big-city teachers are shirkers and that culture abides only where educational progress is most modest.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

JAMES STINCHCOMB

Courses of Study for High Schools: Latin. Issued by the Department of Public Instruction. Published by the State of Iowa: Des Moines (1931). Pp. 80<sup>1</sup>.

Activities of the pupil, procedures of the teacher, and systematic testing receive major attention in the new Iowa Latin course. Of the three the testing receives the most careful consideration. Footnotes classify all the available standard tests for each phase of Latin study; such tests are, however, not made to seem more important than the informal tests recommended for each step. A sincere effort is made to help a Latin teacher conform to any School's testing program, however freakish, even in the chartless reaches of literary appreciation and collateral projects.

In building this course a small committee of teachers followed a plan adopted by an earlier committee of superintendents and principals. The teachers tried to coordinate the Classical Investigation objectives with current scholastic fashions and local conditions, and flavored liberally with good sense and judgment the resultant composite. Professor T. J. Kirby, Professor of Education in the State University of Iowa, directed the development of the whole undertaking <mirabile dictu! C. K.>.

Honest facing of the fact that relatively few Iowa Schools offer Latin beyond the second year has led to concentration upon the possibilities of the briefer course. Except for compression in the second and the

<sup>1</sup>The contents include Foreword (5), Acknowledgements (7-8), General Introduction (9-10), Appendix A, bibliographical in nature (77-78), Appendix B, about dealing with classes in Cicero and Vergil (79-80).

The rest of the pamphlet (13-76) deals with the work of eight "Semesters" (the seventh and the eighth "Semesters" are treated together). In connection with the first four terms the topics treated are vocabulary, mastery of forms, principles of syntax, reading easy Latin, English derivatives, collateral reading. For the three remaining terms "Literary Appreciation" is added. For the last two terms "Metrical Reading" is added. The bibliography (77-78) presents "a minimum list. . .". THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is not mentioned. The Classical Journal is named (its title is wrongly given), and thirteen lines, out of a total of sixty-nine, are devoted to the Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, New York, New York C. K.>.

third terms the content is efficiently organized. If less time is to be spent on Latin, surely more of the language must be learned in the first weeks. A minimum of Latin cannot bear a maximum of "enrichment" (that ugly metaphor appears too often in Latin pedagogy). Twenty-four pages give teachers succinct directions for all possible procedures, but no help in selecting the best procedure. The lists of "Pupil Activities" (9, 16, 20-22, 26-67, 32-33, 40-41, 43-44, 45, 46, 49, 51, etc.) will aid none but the stupidest teachers. But the paragraphs on "Evidences of Mastery" (10, 17, 22, 27-28, 34, 41) will make many a teacher respect the Latin pamphlet of the Iowa Course of Study Commission.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

JAMES STINCHCOMB

Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. By Carl Darling Buck. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1933). Pp. xvi, 405.

There has long been demand for a book by means of which students of the Classics could gain insight into the portions of linguistic science of most immediate importance to them. It is a pleasure to say that Professor Buck, in the book under review, Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin, has met this demand about as well as any one book can. He has shown great skill in making an abstruse subject clear to the beginner. He assumes no knowledge of linguistic science or of any languages except English, Greek, and Latin. Words and processes are cited from many other languages, to be sure, but merely to throw light upon the facts and the history of Greek and Latin, and pains are taken to make clear the bearing of the extraneous material upon the problem in hand.

The Introduction (1-67) contains an account of the Indo-European family of languages (1-15), a more detailed account of the general characteristics and external history of Greek (15-23), and of Italic, particularly Latin (23-30), and a treatment of Some General Features of Linguistic History (30-67), including phonetics, phonetic law, writing and its relation to speech, analogy, semantics, linguistic structure, language and dialect, etc. The chapter<sup>1</sup> entitled Phonology (68-167) sketches the history of the alphabet and then traces the development of each Indo-European sound into and through the classical tongues. With great ingenuity Professor Buck combines his treatment of corresponding phenomena of the two languages wherever similar developments make this advantageous, while divergent developments of Greek and of Latin are treated in successive paragraphs. This is less logical but much more economical and effective than the alternative plan<sup>2</sup> of devoting separate sections to the Greek sounds and to the Latin. A similar arrangement is adopted in the chapter on Inflection (168-310) and in that on Word Formation (311-363). There is an Appendix (364-372) consisting of a Selected Bibliography (364-367) and Notes and References (367-372). The latter section takes the place of footnotes

<sup>1</sup>The chapters are not numbered. C. K.>.

<sup>2</sup>Followed by Antoine Meillet and Joseph Vendryes, *Grammaire Comparée des Langues Classiques* (Paris, 1924).



(although there are a very few footnotes besides) and of references in the text itself to the literature of the subject. This is a device which Professor Buck has used more extensively in his *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects* (Revised Edition, Boston, Ginn, 1928), and in his *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1904; reprinted in 1928). Its advantage seems to be that it facilitates the making of additions and corrections without altering the pagination of the body of the book—a matter of some importance since the mechanical advances (?) in American commercial bookmaking have made really new editions too expensive. The disadvantage is that the reader must either mark up his book with penciled cross-references or always turn to the back of the book after consulting any paragraph of the text or run the risk of missing some important remark on the topic he has in hand. The book is closed by an index of Greek words (373-389) and an index of Latin words (389-405).

In his Preface (v) Professor Buck says:

I am undertaking here to set forth what now appear to me the most essential and best established facts, and what in my present judgment are the most probable views on such disputed matters as I have thought wise to touch upon. Argumentary discussion is avoided, and references to the views of others, whether those adopted or rejected, are omitted or relegated to the Appendix.

The book thus does not pretend to be a complete treatment of its subject. Scholars must still rely upon such books as Karl Brugmann and Albert Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>4</sup> (Munich, Beck, 1913), or Stolz-Schmalz *Lateinische Grammatik*, fifth edition, by Manu Leumann and Johannes Hofmann (Munich, Beck, 1928). It goes without saying, however, that no one can safely neglect what Professor Buck has to say. His judgment of what is most probable and the reasons he gives for that judgment must be taken into account by everyone, but after all his book is intended as an introduction for beginners, and it must be judged as such.

Perhaps the outstanding merit of the book is that it is clear and convincing without being dogmatic. Professor Buck is not one of those who imagine that efficient teaching calls for the expression of certainty where no certainty exists. He takes his readers completely into his confidence, and so his pages abound with such expressions as "it is uncertain whether", "it is often stated that", "some think that". Unfortunately he does not realize how nicely calculated such statements are to arouse scientific curiosity; he ought always to have facilitated the answering of the questions that are sure to result. A teacher who uses the book with a class had better, if he values his reputation with his students, find and read the literature thus hinted at; the beginner who uses the book by himself will generally be quite helpless on these points.

Although any other scholar will be sure to disagree now and then in matters of detail with Professor Buck, it is hard to imagine a sounder book than this or one that more successfully picks out the things that all classical scholars need to know about Greek and Latin grammar. Nevertheless it is to be hoped that no classical department will try to substitute the reading of this

book for lectures by a competent teacher on Greek and Latin grammar. Scientific grammar is the most difficult and the most entirely novel subject that graduate students of the Classics have to master. Practically everything else they need to know has been touched upon in the course of their preparatory and undergraduate training, but in practically all instances their grammatical study has been exclusively of the traditional scholastic variety. It requires much more than the reading of one book, however excellent, to uproot a whole set of incorrect prejudices and to inculcate a totally new point of view.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

EDGAR H. STURTEYANT

Language. By Leonard Bloomfield. New York: Henry Holt and Company (1933). Pp. ix, 564<sup>1</sup>.

In his Preface (vii) Professor Bloomfield calls the book under review, *Language*, "a revised version of the author's *Introduction to the Study of Language*, which appeared in 1914 (New York, Henry Holt and Company)...." In reality, however, it is a new book. It is not merely larger by about 95 per cent; a very considerable part of the contents of the earlier work has been omitted or so far altered as to be scarcely recognizable.

The fundamental purpose remains the same (Preface, vii): "Like its predecessor, this book is intended for the general reader and for the student who is entering upon linguistic work...." Any such book must at every turn combat the absurd pseudo-philosophical prejudices about language that many educated persons now hold, and it would be hard to imagine a more devastating attack upon this stronghold of ignorance. On the positive side Professor Bloomfield is generally conservative. When he treats disputed points, he never takes a dogmatic tone. Any person who masters this book will get as sound an outlook upon language as can be had. In that sense it may be called the best available introduction to linguistic science.

But an introduction must not make demands upon beginners that are beyond their powers. Professor Bloomfield's book is certainly a difficult book. Many readers will need fuller expositions and more illustrative material in order to grasp the unfamiliar point of view, but the chief difficulty lies in the technical terminology. Few books on language have presented so many new terms and new definitions of old terms. In as far as these are needed, it may be argued that their introduction really facilitates the mastery of the science;

<sup>1</sup>The contents of the book are as follows: Preface (vii-viii); <Table of> Contents (ix); 1, The Study of Language (3-20), 2, The Use of Language (21-41), 3, Speech-Communities (42-56), 4, The Languages of the World (57-73), 5, The Phoneme (74-92), 6, Types of Phonemes (93-108), 7, Modifications (109-126), 8, Phonetic Structure (127-138), 9, Meaning (139-157), 10, Grammatical Forms (158-169), 11, Sentence-Types (170-183), 12, Syntax (184-206), 13, Morphology (207-226), 14, Morphologic Types (227-246), 15, Substitution (247-263), 16, Form-Classes and Lexicon (264-280), 17, Written Records (281-296), 18, The Comparative Method (297-320), 19, Dialect Geography (321-345), 20, Phonetic Change (346-368), 21, Types of Phonetic Change (369-391), 22, Fluctuation in the Frequency of Forms (392-403), 23, Analogic Change (404-424), 24, Semantic Change (425-443), 25, Cultural Borrowing (444-460), 26, Intimate Borrowing (461-475), 27, Dialect Borrowing (476-495), 28, Applications and Outlook (496-509); Notes (511-524); Bibliography (525-545); Table of Phonetic Symbols (547-549); Index (551-564). C. K. >

arithmetic is certainly made easier by the use of the necessary technical terms. At present, however, a large proportion of Professor Bloomfield's new terms occurs nowhere else; the reader must learn them purely for the sake of understanding this book. Besides, they are not always fully illustrated at their first occurrence, and they are rarely compared and contrasted with the grammatical terminology with which the reader is already familiar. One gets the impression that the author has such facility in originating new language that he underestimates the difficulty that results for the rest of us from such origination. Perhaps the book is not beyond the comprehension of a beginner of average intelligence, but it makes greater demands upon his attention than are usual in introductory treatises.

No such reservation is necessary in estimating the book as a contribution to linguistic science. The new terminology cannot fail to clarify our thinking; doubtless much of it will win general acceptance. The discrimination between descriptive grammar (Chapters 4-17: 3-296) and the historical and comparative study of language is by no means new, but it has rarely if ever

been carried through so consistently. The former subject is here worked out largely on the basis of American English as spoken in Chicago, and there emerge from the discussion some main outlines of a descriptive grammar of English utterly unlike any yet published. One may hope that the task thus begun will presently be completed in the form of a new English Grammar. Such a book would finally banish the queer reflection of Latin grammar that has hitherto prevented an understanding of the structure of our native tongue.

Professor Bloomfield's statement of the case for the generally accepted axioms of linguistic science is the best we have. In particular it is hard to see how any scholar can again assume 'sporadic' phonetic change. At the same time I hope to show elsewhere that we cannot be content with ascribing the regularity of this process to its gradual nature, as Professor Bloomfield does. He himself, I think, supplies the material for showing the falsity of his position. That again is a mark of a good book.

YALE UNIVERSITY

EDGAR H. STURTEVANT